

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 11, 2004 (Paper No. 23). Claims 53, 54, 56 and 58 to 63 are in the application, of which all have been indicated as allowed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for his follow through on commitments made during the personal interview of August 4, 2003.

Turning first to formal matters involving the format of the specification, the Office Action summary indicated that objections were lodged against the specification. However, Applicants have been unable to find any mention of an objection, although there is a generalized request for "cooperation" in correction of errors. Applicants of course confirm their cooperation in this matter. However, since Applicants are unable to determine whether an objection against the specification was or was not entered, clarification of the matter is respectfully requested. For the record, Applicants will take no further action on this matter, and will presume that the Office Action summary checked the objection to the specification through inadvertence, unless specifically indicated otherwise is a subsequent Office communication.

Likewise, an objection was lodged against the replacement drawing sheets filed on March 28, 2003. Again, Applicants can find no mention of an actual objection in the body of the Office Action. Clarification of this matter is requested as well, and

Applicants will take no further action unless specifically indicated otherwise in a further Office Communication.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, Applicants thank the Examiner for his indication that Claims 53, 54, 56 and 58 to 63 have been allowed.

Claims 47 to 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Published Application 2002/0015066 (Siwinski) in view of U.S. Patent 5,735,167 (Puukangas) and U.S. Patent 5,743,138 (Cheng). As shown above, Claims 47 to 50 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of the rejection, but rather strictly to advance this application to an earlier allowance.

It is therefore believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance and such action is courteously solicited.

FOURTH REQUEST FOR INITIALLED FORMS PTO-1449

Multiple Information Disclosure Statements have been filed for this application. To date, however, Applicants have not yet received initialled forms PTO-1449 for the following three Information Disclosure Statements: a first dated January 13, 2003 (filed January 14, 2003); a second dated August 20, 2003 (filed August 22, 2003); and a third dated February 26, 2004 (filed February 27, 2004).

It is respectfully requested for the Examiner to indicate his consideration of the art cited in these three Information Disclosure Statements, by initialling the forms PTO-1449 that were included with them.

For two of these Information Disclosure Statements, this is a fourth request.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael K. D'Amico", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 81125 v 1